

the whole idea that computer models were accurate. Even the New York Times has been forced to acknowledge the overwhelming evidence that the Earth is currently well within natural climate variation. This inconvenient reality means that all the warming doomsayers have to back up their climate fears are unproven computer models predicting future doom. Of course, you can't prove a prediction of the climate in 2100 wrong today, which reduces the models to speculating on what could or might or may happen 50 years from now or 100 years from now.

But prominent U.N. scientists have publicly questioned the reliability of climate models. This is kind of interesting because it is the U.N. that started this whole thing. The IPCC, the scientists, Dr. Jim Renwick, a lead author of the IPCC Fourth Assessment Report—this is the United Nations—publicly admitted that climate models may not be so reliable after all.

He stated in June:

Half of the variability in the climate system is not predictable, so we don't expect to do terrifically well.

Let me repeat, a U.N. scientist admitted half of the variability in the climate system is not predictable.

Also in June, another high-profile U.N. lead author, Dr. Kevin Trenberth, echoed Renwick's sentiments about climate models by referring to them as nothing more than story lines.

Keep in mind, what we are talking about are the things that all this is based on and the distinguished junior Senator from California spent about 15 minutes of her 1 hour talking about—computer models. They have all been debunked.

Now, as far as Greenland is concerned, this is kind of interesting because, in fact, current temperatures in Greenland—and Greenland has been the poster boy for climate alarmists—the current temperatures are cooler than the temperatures there in the mid 1930s and 1940s, according to multiple peer-reviewed studies. You heard me right. Greenland has cooled since the 1940s, a fact the media and global warming activists conceal. Greenland reached its highest temperatures in 1941, according to a peer-reviewed study published in the June of 2006 issue of the "Journal of Geophysical Research." Keep in mind the 80 percent of manmade CO<sub>2</sub> after these high temperatures.

According to a July 2007 report from the Environment and Public Works Committee on Greenland:

Research in 2006 found that Greenland has been warming since the 1880s, but since 1955, temperature averages at Greenland stations have been colder than the period between 1881 and 1995. Another 2006 peer-reviewed study concluded the rate of warming in Greenland from 1920 to 1930 was about 50 percent higher than the warming from 1995 to 2005. One 2005 study found Greenland gaining ice in the interior higher elevations and thinning ice at the lower elevations.

So it has gone over and over again, the fact that it is factual, that it has actually been getting cooler in Greenland.

By the way, I think it is also interesting when you talk about global warming, consistently through the last several decades, the Southern Hemisphere has actually been getting cooler. The last time I checked, the Southern Hemisphere was part of the globe.

So I think if we want to talk about some of the changes in terms of the scientists that have been coming along, we could do that. I think one of the well-known—the scientist staff writer, Juliet Eilperin, from the Washington Post conceded that climate skeptics appear to be expanding rather than shrinking.

Geologist Peter Sciaky echoes this growing backlash of leftwing activists about global warming. He describes himself as a "liberal and a leftist" and wrote on June 9:

I do not know a single geologist who believes that global warming is a man-made phenomena.

I think that former Vice President Gore's biggest worry is becoming a reality right now, and that is that all these scientists who were on his side 10 years or so ago are now on the other side saying: Wait a minute, we thought we were right at that time.

The 60 scientists who were advising the Prime Minister of Canada and advised him back in the middle 1990s to sign onto the Kyoto Treaty, after re-evaluating, they said:

If, back in the mid 1990s, we knew what we know today about climate, Kyoto would almost certainly not exist, because we would have concluded it was not necessary.

So you get back to the 60 scientists who advised the Prime Minister at that time to join in the Kyoto Treaty, and right now they have all signed a letter advising Prime Minister Harper not to join on or sign onto any successor of the Kyoto Treaty.

So when we talk about Claude Allegra from France, David Bellamy from the U.K., and Nir Shaviv from Israel, these are people who were on the other side who have come over.

I think that in my 2-plus-hour presentation I made last Friday, I covered most of the things—the objections that were given on the floor by my good friend, Senator BOXER. I see my friend from New Mexico is here. If he would like me to yield the remainder of my time to him, I say to Senator DOMENICI, I would be glad to do so.

Mr. DOMENICI. Senator, how much time is that?

Mr. INHOFE. I don't know.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITEHOUSE). About 4½ minutes remain.

Mr. DOMENICI. I appreciate that. First, I wish to thank the Senator. I wish to say to the Senate, I talked to Senator LOTT, and I understand that when the 4½ minutes is up, the regular order will be that we return to Amtrak; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. The Senator indicated to me he was next with some

amendments, but he would be willing to give me about 5 minutes. Now, we can do it either way. We can say, I would like 5 minutes before—what I have been given here, plus 5 before we go to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator seek unanimous consent?

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask unanimous consent to that effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. That means I can go up to 9½. I am not sure I will, but who knows. This is a favorite subject, so I might talk all night if you let me.

## ENERGY

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I am here because the distinguished majority leader spoke today, and I wasn't here when he talked about the two Energy bills that are outstanding—maybe it is three. The House has a couple of Energy bills and we have one, and they are languishing, so to speak, because there is no conference, no official conference. The distinguished majority leader used the phrase, saying we ought to marry the two bills. Now, the leader knows I have every bit of respect for him, and I have talked with him about this Energy bill at least 10 times. I have even suggested in writing some ideas about how we might have a conference that is not a conference but accomplishes the same thing. With that, I wish to say right off, Mr. Leader and fellow Senators, these two bills are so different, so different, that they are incompatible.

So you cannot say marry them, because that marriage cannot last. You cannot start it because the bills are diametrically different, with the exception of a few pieces that are not terribly relevant that are the same. What they have, we don't have; what we have, they don't have. You cannot marry them. It is a hard job to work a bill when you don't have a conference.

I will repeat what I have suggested. At least 2 Republican Senators who were part of the big bill—maybe myself from the Energy Committee, and maybe Senator STEVENS from Commerce—have to be part of negotiating every part of the bill or it is going to be very difficult to get 60 votes in the Senate. I cannot make it any clearer. That is what I have told them. I still say that. I don't know where we do it, but maybe we could informally agree to something like that. So don't bring up a big piece of the bill that has been negotiated out between some House Members and Senate Members but you have not worked it with the Senators who put together the basic pieces of the big bill in the Senate.

As a member of the Senate Energy Committee for 30 years, I have learned a lot about what it takes to pass a comprehensive, bipartisan energy bill and get it signed. As chairman in 2005, I shepherded through the Senate the

most comprehensive Energy bill in decades. Over time, when fully implemented, this bill will have a very positive impact across every sector of energy. Strengthening America's energy security doesn't have an overnight solution. It is not something that can be accomplished in 5-second bites. Instead, it requires long vision and courage to make a difficult decision. Both the Senate and the House have passed bills, as I indicated. While the Senate bill takes big, important steps to diversify our fuel sources to increase our energy efficiency and conservation, the House bill does little more than, in a sense, increase the energy cost for America.

The majority leader suggested that we marry these bills, as I indicated. However, this marriage of convenience would be an inconvenient burden. I would call it an incompatibility for those who fill up their gas tanks and heat their homes.

The centerpiece of our Senate efforts on energy is a mandate which would require an increasing portion of our fuel to come from advanced biofuels such as cellulosic ethanol. These newly advanced, clean biofuels will eventually help make America less dependent upon foreign oil. The House Energy bill contains no such provisions and, in fact, takes steps that would reduce our domestic energy supply. This led a former Member of the Senate to write:

unless Congress includes provisions for increasing supply, this will remain an energy bill without energy.

Again, that was a former Senator. I think people could guess who it is. He is from down South, maybe from Louisiana.

The House repeals numerous provisions of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 that are already increasing domestic energy production. Across the country, applications for drilling permits are on the rise. I know a little bit about it. That is out in my part of the country. I know that sounds wrong, but they are on the rise. Last year, we did produce more oil than we did before because the activities are taking place. We will need to continue this rise to keep up with our Nation's demand for domestic oil and natural gas. Instead of expediting the process of domestic oil and gas production, the House bill slows it down. Instead of decreasing domestic gas and oil exploration and production costs, the House bill increases the costs.

I guess the answer to that is, well, everybody is making too much money, so increase costs. Frankly, we don't generally do that in the United States. That is what we have tried before when we had such strange things as a tax on the rich. We tried an extra tax on oil because it was making too much money. We got in big trouble because it never did work.

The price tag is a \$16 billion tax increase on American oil and gas production—on big and small businesses alike. This is a conservative estimate,

and I fear one that will increase behind closed doors.

The House bill results in a punitive fee on deep sea production or, in the alternative, a ban on future leasing altogether. That one is an interesting one. People look at that and say it is good, we ought to do it. Incidentally, that is so anti-American, you cannot believe it. I believe it is also unconstitutional as an *ex post facto* law. But that is not the issue. That is one of the things we are not going to marry up because plenty of Members in the Senate—at least on our side of the aisle—think that because a mistake was made—not made by a Republican President, it was made during the Presidency of our last Democratic President. A mistake was made and the royalty requirements were not included and the bids let. Those people who got those bids and didn't pay any royalties were trying to collect from them after the fact. That is one of their provisions in the House bill and not in ours. You could tell that is in for a heavy fight.

I don't know whether you could pass a bill in the Senate that had the division they have. They say any of those companies in that position, they pay up something they don't owe, but they pay it up anyway or they cannot drill for 20 years. I cannot imagine anything that looks more anti-American, more like a banana republic that takes over oil companies and releases them and nobody knows what is going on. These types of measures will reduce our domestic energy supply, increase our energy cost and, over time, play into the hands of the large state-owned oil companies in unstable regions around the world.

The House-passed Energy bill is a gift to our global competitors in China, Russia, and the Middle East. This is not just an energy issue, it is a national security issue. The more we increase our dependence, the less secure we become. The higher prices we put on energy at home, the greater the costs we place on our strategic competitiveness abroad.

The House Energy bill doesn't end at increasing costs for consumers at the pump. It also targets those of us who use electricity. By requiring States that lack natural resources to meet an unachievable, mandatory, renewable portfolio standard, we increase costs. Those who cannot meet this standard will simply pay a fee. Remember, that was not offered in the Senate. My friend, the chairman of the committee, is for that and he didn't offer it. I speculate that he didn't offer it because it might have made the bill impossible to pass. But it is in the House bill, so it is not so easy to say let's go and marry them. Somebody has to sit down and talk seriously about whether that kind of provision can stand the test of a head count as to whether we can get a bill through the Senate.

If I am needed, I am needed to help get a bill. If I am not needed to get a bill, you can marry anything to any-

thing and bring it to the floor and see what can happen.

I have been a long-time supporter of renewable energy in both the appropriations process and in the Energy Policy Act of 2005. I led efforts to protect an offshore wind project in unfair opposition. The bill I authored provided the largest and most important tax incentives for renewable energy in American history. We don't need to do anything else to help with wind energy. It is growing at the most rapid pace of any of the renewables. As a matter of fact, it is my understanding the orders for turbines for wind energy are so far behind that you have to wait for 2 years. Most of them are being made overseas. You see, it won't do any good—we don't need more States mandated to produce 15 percent of their energy through wind, and they are allowing a 4-percent credit or something. We ought to increase the tax incentive, so it is not going out too quickly.

I support sound, smart policy on increasing our domestic renewable energy supply, but I oppose tax increases on the American energy consumers.

The next 30 years will bring a massive shift in American wealth if we continue to increase our dependence on foreign oil. That is what will happen. Plainly and simply, the Senate bill moves away from this trend. The House bill does not; it accelerates it. I will say that again. The next 30 years will bring a massive shift of American wealth if we continue to increase our dependence. That shift is at an incredible level at this point.

For these reasons, we cannot simply marry these two bills in the dark of the night. Instead, we need a bipartisan conference committee similar to the one we had in 2005. If we cannot get it in any official way, we are going to have to find a way to do it. It cannot be expected that those on the other side of the aisle will meet with certain Republicans and they will change these bills and say now we have married the bills and we can pass them. That will not happen.

This is a difficult bill on the Senate side but a good one. As a matter of fact, I can say the bill that passed the Senate is one of the best bills we have ever passed. It sort of came from three committees, and it is different, but it will certainly, over 10 years, do a lot for our country. But you don't put on top of it a tax—this tax of \$16 billion. They tried it here and it was defeated on the Energy bill. But because the House has it, there is talk that we have to marry it up and take their tax provision. Where are you going to get the votes for that? And that is so with other things that are in the House bill and not in ours.

I thank Senator LOTT for being patient. Clearly, we will discuss the issue more and maybe sit down at a table and talk about it among Senators of both parties.

I yield the floor.